

## **REMARKS**

Claim 40 has been amended. Claims 1-51 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

### **Section 102(e) Rejection:**

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 18 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by He et al. (U.S. Patent 6,088,451) (hereinafter “He”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in light of the following remarks.

The Examiner states that He teaches the client using a capability credential to request an access interface document to access a service, the client receiving the access interface document, wherein the access interface document comprises an interface for accessing only a portion of the service’s capabilities, and the client using the interface from the access interface document to access a capability from the portion of the service’s capabilities. Applicants assert that the Examiner’s interpretation of He is incorrect, as is discussed in further detail below.

The Examiner refers to the teaching in He regarding the client receiving from the credential server 204 a credential ticket containing a list of user credentials (col. 18, line 34 – col. 19, line 39). According to He, the user then presents this ticket obtained from the credential server 204 to the network element access server 206 to obtain another ticket to access a specific network element (col. 20, line 14 – col. 21, line 22). The user then presents this ticket for the specific network element to the local access control mechanism of the specific network element which either honors or denies the user’s access request (col. 21, lines 14-49). Thus, He teaches a hierarchy of tickets that are used for access control. However, the access control credentials and tickets in He are only used for access control. No credential or ticket in He is an access interface document comprises an interface for accessing only a portion of the first service’s capabilities. He does not teach the client using the interface from the access interface document to access

a capability from the portion of the service's capabilities. The credentials and tickets in He are only used for access control. He is not concerned with the interface by which a client accesses a service. In He, the client requests an access control ticket, not an interface document comprising an interface for accessing only a portion of the service's capabilities. Similar arguments apply in regard to independent claims 18 and 35.

Applicants remind the Examiner that anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. M.P.E.P 2131; *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claims. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Applicants' invention as recited in claim 1 is clearly not anticipated by He.

#### **Section 103(a) Rejection:**

The Office Action rejected claims 2-17, 19-34 and 36-51 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over He in view of Pulliam et al. (U.S. Patent 6,609,108) (hereinafter "Pulliam"). Applicants assert that these claims are patentable for at least the reasons given above in regard to their respective independent claims. Applicants further traverse the rejection of these claims for at least the following reasons.

In regard to claim 2, the Examiner refers to Pulliam in addition to He. However, Pulliam teaches an online shopping communication schema for communication online shopping orders such as vehicle orders. Pulliam has nothing to do with a client requesting an interface document comprising an interface usable by the client to access only a portion of a service's capabilities. Therefore, Applicants fail to see the relevance of Pulliam.

The Examiner appears to be asserting that it would be obvious to modify the sending of ticket requests in He to comprise sending a request message in a data

representation language. Applicants can find no such suggestion from the teaching in Pulliam. The use of XML in Pulliam is for describing data in on line shopping order messages. Pulliam's teaching have nothing to do with requesting access control tickets as in He. In fact, Pulliam teaches that access control is provided PKI encrypted user credentials (*see* Pulliam -- col. 9, lines 38-44). The user credentials in Pulliam are not requested by sending a request message in a data representation language. Therefore, the Examiner's modification of He's system is clearly not supported by the teachings of the cited art.

Moreover, even if He's system was modified so that a user requested a ticket by sending a request message in a data representation language, the request would still be for just a ticket, not an interface document comprising an interface usable by the client to access only a portion of a service's capabilities.

In regard to claim 4, He and Pulliam do not teach generating a custom advertisement in response to receiving the advertisement request message, the custom advertisement is generated according to the portion of the service's capabilities that the capability credential indicates the client is allowed to access, and sending an advertisement request response message to the client, wherein the advertisement request response message includes the custom advertisement as the access interface document. The pull-down menus in He and Pulliam referred to by the Examiner have nothing to do with generating a custom advertisement as the access interface document according to the portion of the service's capabilities that the capability credential indicates the client is allowed to access. The pull down menus in He simply "identify those network element to which [the user] is allowed access." The pull down menus in He have nothing to do with generating a custom interface document. The section of Pulliam cited by the Examiner pertains to "pull-down lists of available makes and models" which may be used to select "preferences" for "matching vehicles." Pulliam's teachings have nothing to do with generating a custom interface document that includes an interface for a client to use to access a capability of a service.

In regard to claim 5, the cited art does not teach or suggest a custom advertisement that specifies an XML schema defining messages to be sent by the client to the service and messages to be sent from the service to the client to use the portion of the service's capabilities. The portions of Pulliam cited by the Examiner refer to the use of XML "to support application-to-application data exchange formats." In Pulliam, XML is used to describe the data content of messages, not the messages themselves. The use of XML in Pulliam is not to define messages to be sent by the client to the service and messages to be sent from the service to the client to use the portion of the service's capabilities.

The rejection of claim 5 is further improper because the Examiner has not explained how Pulliam suggests modifying He's system. The use of an XML schema in Pulliam to describe data to be exchange in online shopping to not have any relevance to the access control ticket requests in He. Therefore, the combination of references is improper.

In regard to claim 6, the cited art does not teach or suggest the client receiving a protected advertisement for the service, wherein the protected advertisement provides an address to request the security credential, but does not provide the access interface document to access the service. The Examiner refers to the ticket obtained from the authentication server 202 in He. However, the ticket obtained from the authentication server 202 in He does not provide any address information (*see* col. 17, line 28 – col. 18, line 32).

Applicants also assert that each of dependent claims 7-17 recited further limitations over He and Pulliam. These differences are self-evident based on the discussion of claims 1-6 above.

The arguments above also apply to the corresponding ones of dependent claims 19-34 and 36-51.

**Information Disclosure Statement:**

Applicants appreciate the return of the signed and initialed copies of the forms PTO-1449 from four of the six information disclosure statements submitted for the present application. However, Applicants note that the Examiner did not return the signed and initial copies of the forms PTO-1449 from the information disclosure statements submitted on July 16, 2001 and October 9, 2003, respectively. Applicants request the Examiner to carefully consider the listed references and return copies of the signed and initialed Forms PTO-1449 from both of these statements.

## CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any extension of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) is necessary to prevent the above referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicants hereby petition for such extension. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5181-70500/RCK.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

- ☒ Return Receipt Postcard
- ☐ Petition for Extension of Time
- ☐ Notice of Change of Address
- ☐ Fee Authorization Form authorizing a deposit account debit in the amount of \$  
for fees (        ).
- ☐ Other:

Respectfully submitted,



Robert C. Kowert  
Reg. No. 39,255  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.  
P.O. Box 398  
Austin, TX 78767-0398  
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: June 28, 2004